

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11
12 ALEXANDRA RASEY-SMITH, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15
16 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al.,

17 Defendants.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 2:24-cv-03265-MWC-SSC

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
EXHIBITS UNDER SEAL IN
SUPPORT OF THEIR OPPOSITION
TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
(DKT. 60)**

1 The Court has considered Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Lodge Exhibits
2 Under Seal in Support of Their Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Partial
3 Summary Judgment (the "Motion"). *See* Dkt. # 60. On December 26, 2025,
4 Plaintiffs moved to lodge transcript excerpts designated as confidential by
5 Defendants under seal in light of their production pursuant to a protective order;
6 however, they argued there does not exist good cause to seal the transcripts. *See id.*
7 Local Rule 79-5.2.2 (b) requires the designating party, within 4 days of an
8 application to seal being made, file a declaration establishing that all or part of the
9 designated material is sealable by showing good cause or demonstrating compelling
10 reasons why the strong presumption of public access in civil cases should be
11 overcome. L.R. 79-5.2.2 (b)(i). Defendants have not filed this declaration or
12 demonstrated good cause to seal the transcript excerpts. *See* Dkt.

13 Accordingly, the Motion is **DENIED**.

14 The filing party is **DIRECTED** to file the documents unsealed no earlier than
15 4 days and no later than 10 days after the date of this Order, in accordance with
16 Local Rule 79-5.5(b)(ii).

17
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 Dated: December 31, 2025



Honorable Michelle W. Court
United States District Court
Central District of California